arXiv:cond-mat/0501725v1 [cond-mat.mes-hall] 29 Jan 2005

Decoherence of the Kondo Singlet via a Quantum Point Contact Detector

Kicheon Kang*
Department of Physics and Institute for Condensed Matter Theory, Chonnam National University, Gwangju 500-757, Korea
(Dated: February 2, 2008)

We investigate the effect of the charge state measurement of the Kondo singlet for a quantum dot transistor via a capacitively coupled quantum point contact detector. By employing the variational ansatz for the singlet ground state of the quantum dot combined with the density matrix formulation for the coupled system, we show that the coherent Kondo singlet is destroyed by the phase-sensitive as well as the magnitude-sensitive detection in the transmission/reflection coefficients at the quantum point contact. We argue that the phase-sensitive component of the decoherence rate may explain the anomalous features observed in a recent experiment by Avinun-Kalish *et al.* (Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 156801 (2004)). We also discuss the correlations of the shot noise at the quantum point contact detector and the decoherence in the quantum dot.

PACS numbers: 73.23.-b,72.15.Qm,03.65.Yz

Decoherence induced by the measurement of charge in mesoscopic electronic devices provides an ideal playground for studying the wave-particle duality in quantum mechanics. Experiments on the controlled dephasing were performed in mesoscopic structures based on quantum dots (QD) in the Coulomb blockade limit [1, 2]. While the coherent transmission of electrons through a QD is monitored by using an Aharonov-Bohm interferometer [3, 4], a nearby quantum point contact (QPC) capacitively coupled to the QD (weakly) measures the charge state of the QD, and suppresses quantum coherence. This measurement-induced decoherence is controlled via the applied voltage across the QPC detector. Various different methods have been used to study this problem theoretically [5, 6, 7, 8, 9].

Recently, this kind of controlled dephasing experiment was also performed in the Kondo limit of the QD [10]. Kondo singlet is formed between the localized spin in a QD and electrons in the leads [11], which gives rise to enhanced transport through the QD [12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18]. It was shown that a nearby QPC capacitively coupled to the QD plays a role of a "potential detector" and raises significant suppression of the Kondo resonance [10]. However, characteristics of the measured suppression were very different from the theoretical prediction of Ref. [19]. The most significant deviation from the theory is that the measured suppression strength is much larger (about 30 times) than expected. Dependence on the transmission probability (T_d) and on the bias voltage (V_d) across the QPC were also inconsistent with the theoretical expectation.

The analysis of the experiment [10] was based on a theory [19] of suppression of the Kondo resonance due to the path detection by the QPC via the change of the transmission *probability*, ΔT_d. We point out that this treatment is incomplete, because scattering of electrons at the QPC is a quantum mechanical phenomenon with complex transmission and reflection amplitudes. Therefore *phase-sensitive* detection should also be taken into account [2, 8, 20], in general.

In this Letter, we present a theory of controlled dephasing for the Kondo singlet via charge detection of a nearby QPC. First, we show that the change of the transmission (and reflection) *phase* as well as its probability change induces decoherence of the Kondo-correlated state, unlike in Ref. [10, 19]. Second, by using a simple QPC model, we argue that the phase-sensitive contribution to the decoherence may be much larger than the magnitude-sensitive component (due to ΔT_d) in a typical geometry of the QD-QPC hybrid structure. In addition, we discuss on the T_d-dependence of the decoherence rate which might be correlated with the characteristics of the shot noise in the QPC.

To describe the Kondo singlet of the QD, we adopt the variational ground state for the impurity Anderson model [11, 21], which is known to describe the essential Kondo physics in a very simple but effective way. Further, this approach can be easily combined with the density matrix formulation in the presence of a detector. The Hamiltonian is given by

$$H = H_L + H_R + H_D + H_T \,. \tag{1a}$$

The left (L) and the right (R) leads are described by the noninteracting Fermi sea as

$$H_\alpha = \sum_{k\sigma} \varepsilon_{\alpha k} c^\dagger_{\alpha k\sigma} c_{\alpha k\sigma} \quad (\alpha = L, R)\,, \tag{1b}$$

where $c_{\alpha k\sigma}$ ($c^\dagger_{\alpha k\sigma}$) is an annihilation (creation) operator of an electron with energy $\varepsilon_{\alpha k}$, momentum k, and spin σ on the lead α. The interacting QD is described by

$$H_D = \sum_\sigma \varepsilon_d d^\dagger_\sigma d_\sigma + U n_\uparrow n_\downarrow \,, \tag{1c}$$

where d_σ and $d^\dagger_\sigma$ are QD electron operators, $n_\sigma = d^\dagger_\sigma d_\sigma$, ε_d and U stand for the energy of the localized level and

the on-site Coulomb interaction, respectively. The tunneling Hamiltonian H_T has the form

$$H_T = \sum_{\alpha=L,R} \sum_{k\sigma} \left(V_\alpha d_\sigma^\dagger c_{\alpha k\sigma} + h.c. \right) , \tag{1d}$$

where V_α is responsible for for the tunneling between the QD and the lead α.

In the absence of interaction between the QD and the QPC, the variational ground state for the Hamiltonian H ($U \to \infty$ limit) is written as [21]

$$|\Psi_G\rangle = A \left(|0\rangle + |1\rangle \right) , \tag{2a}$$

where $|0\rangle$ denotes the Fermi sea for the leads with empty QD state, and

$$|1\rangle \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{\alpha\sigma, k<k_F} v_{\alpha k} d_\sigma^\dagger c_{\alpha k\sigma} |0\rangle . \tag{2b}$$

Here $A = \sqrt{1-\bar{n_d}}$, with $\bar{n_d}$ being the average occupation number of the QD level, and $v_{\alpha k} = \sqrt{2} V_\alpha / (E_G - \varepsilon_d + \varepsilon_{\alpha k})$ where E_G denotes the ground state energy determined by the equation

$$E_G = 2 \sum_{\alpha, k<k_F} \frac{V_\alpha^2}{E_G - \varepsilon_d + \varepsilon_{\alpha k}} . \tag{2c}$$

The Kondo temperature (T_K), characteristic energy scale of the system, is given as a difference between the QD level (ε_d) and the ground state energy (E_G): $T_K = \varepsilon_d - E_G$.

In fact the states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ have different occupation numbers for the QD, $n_d = 0$ and $n_d = 1$, respectively. A capacitively coupled QPC to the QD is able to detect the charge state, since the potential of the QPC depends on the charge state of the QD. So the transmission and reflection amplitudes through the QPC also depend on n_d. To describe this situation, it is effective to introduce the density matrix formulation [7, 20, 22]. We assume that the QPC supports only a single transverse mode so that the scattering matrix S_{QPC} through the QPC is a 2×2 matrix that depends on the charge state of the QD:

$$S_{\mathsf{QPC}} = \begin{cases} S_0 & \text{for } |0\rangle, \\ S_1 & \text{for } |1\rangle, \end{cases} \tag{3a}$$

where

$$S_\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} r_\alpha & t'_\alpha \\ t_\alpha & r'_\alpha \end{pmatrix} \quad (\alpha = 0, 1). \tag{3b}$$

We can describe the coupled system by a two-particle scattering matrix [20, 22]

$$S_{\alpha\alpha'} = \delta_{\alpha\alpha'} (\delta_{\alpha 0} S_0 + \delta_{\alpha 1} S_1) \tag{3c}$$

where $\alpha, \alpha' \in \{0, 1\}$. With $\rho^0_{\mathsf{tot}} = \rho^0 \otimes \rho^0_{\mathsf{QPC}}$ being the density matrix of the total system before the passage of an electron through the QPC, the density matrix after scattering is given by $\rho_{\mathsf{tot}} = S \rho^0_{\mathsf{tot}} S^\dagger$. The reduced density matrix of the QD is obtained by tracing out ρ_{tot} over the QPC degree of freedom as

$$\rho = \mathsf{Tr}_{\mathsf{QPC}} \rho_{\mathsf{tot}} . \tag{4a}$$

It is found that the diagonal elements of ρ do not change upon scattering through the QPC, but the off-diagonal elements are modified by

$$\rho_{01} = \lambda \rho^0_{01}, \tag{4b}$$

where

$$\lambda = r_0 r_1^* + t_0 t_1^* . \tag{4c}$$

The QD-charge-dependent transmission/reflection amplitudes are complex numbers and can be rewritten as ($\alpha = 0, 1$ denoting the charge state of the QD)

$$t_\alpha = |t_\alpha| \exp\left(i\phi_{t\alpha}\right) , \tag{4d}$$

$$r_\alpha = |r_\alpha| \exp\left(i\phi_{r\alpha}\right) , \tag{4e}$$

satisfying the relation $|t_\alpha|^2 + |r_\alpha|^2 = 1$.

We consider the limit where the scattering through the QPC takes place on a time scale much shorter than the relevant time scales in the QD. In our case, $\Delta t \ll t_d$, where $\Delta t = h/2eV_d$ denotes the average time between two successive scattering events with V_d being the voltage across the detector, and t_d is the decoherence time of the QD. In this limit one finds that

$$\rho_{01}(t) = e^{(i\Delta\epsilon - \Gamma_d)t} \rho_{01}(0) , \tag{5a}$$

where

$$\Delta\epsilon = \frac{1}{\Delta t} \arg\lambda , \tag{5b}$$

$$\Gamma_d = \frac{1}{t_d} = -\frac{1}{\Delta t} \log|\lambda| . \tag{5c}$$

On the other hand, the diagonal terms are independent of time, which implies that no relaxation of the charge state takes place.

In the weak measurement limit ($\lambda \approx 1$), both Γ_d and $\Delta\epsilon$ can be obtained in terms of the change in the magnitude and phase of transmission/reflection amplitude of the QPC:

$$\Gamma_d = \Gamma_T + \Gamma_\phi \tag{6a}$$

where

$$\Gamma_T = \frac{eV_d}{h} \frac{(\Delta T_d)^2}{4T_d(1-T_d)} , \tag{6b}$$

$$\Gamma_\phi = \frac{eV_d}{h} T_d(1-T_d)(\Delta\phi)^2 , \tag{6c}$$

and

$$\Delta\epsilon = \frac{eV_d}{\pi}(1-T_d)\Delta\phi_r + \frac{eV_d}{\pi}T_d\Delta\phi_t \ . \tag{7}$$

Here $\Delta T_d \equiv |t_0|^2 - |t_1|^2 = |r_1|^2 - |r_0|^2$ represents the change in the transmission probability, and $\Delta\phi = \Delta\phi_t - \Delta\phi_r$ with $\Delta\phi_t$ ($\Delta\phi_r$) being the change in the transmission (reflection) amplitude due to different charge states: $\Delta\phi_t = \phi_{t0} - \phi_{t1}$, $\Delta\phi_r = \phi_{r0} - \phi_{r1}$. Note that Γ_ϕ was not taken into account in the analysis of the experiment [10].

Given the reduced density matrix, we can evaluate the retarded Green's function for the QD by using the formula

$$G_d(\omega) = -i\int_0^\infty dt\, e^{i\omega t}\mathsf{Tr}\left(\rho(t)[d_\sigma(t), d_\sigma^\dagger]_+\right) \ , \tag{8}$$

where $[\cdots,\cdots]_+$ denotes the anti-commutator. The Green's function can be evaluated in a similar way to the one in Ref.[21]. One has to use equations of motions for various Green's functions and truncate higher order terms of $1/N_s$ with N_s being the spin degeneracy. Neglecting incoherent background and the energy shift $\Delta\epsilon$, we obtain

$$G_d(\omega) \simeq \frac{(1-\bar{n_d})^2}{\omega - T_K} + \frac{\bar{n_d}(1-\bar{n_d})}{\omega - T_K + i\Gamma_d} \ , \tag{9}$$

The effect of decoherence can be investigated by the V_d-dependence of the conductance through the QD, $G(V_d)$, which is proportional to $|G_d(\omega=0)|^2$ at zero temperature. We define the renormalized conductance $g(V_d)$ as

$$g(V_d) \equiv G(V_d)/G(V_d=0) \ . \tag{10}$$

From Eq.(9) one can find

$$g(V_d) = \frac{T_K^2 + (1-\bar{n_d})^2\Gamma_d^2}{T_K^2 + \Gamma_d^2} \ , \tag{11}$$

which reduces to

$$g(V_d) \simeq T_K^2/(T_K^2 + \Gamma_d^2) \tag{12}$$

in the Kondo limit [23]. Note that the V_d-dependence of $g(V_d)$ comes through the relation (5c).

From our results (Eqs.(4c,5c,6, 12)) it is obvious that the Kondo resonance is reduced by the measurement via the coherent scattering at the QPC. This coherent scattering is described by the complex transmission and reflection coefficients. In the weak measurement limit, the decoherence rate is given by the phase-sensitive ($\Delta\phi$) as well as the magnitude-sensitive (ΔT_d) detection. The analysis of the experiment (10) is based only on the first term of Eq.(5c). In the following, we argue that the phase-sensitive term can be dominant in certain situation, which may explain anomalous features reported in the experiment.

Much stronger decoherence rate than predicted in the theory based only on Γ_T suggests $\Gamma_\phi \gg \Gamma_T$. Here we discuss on the condition this relation can be achieved. First, $\Delta\phi = 0$ if the QPC potential and its variation due to an extra QD electron have mirror symmetries [24, 25], and thus the phase-sensitive detection does not appear. However, in reality, there is no reason to believe that the response of the QPC potential to the QD charge should be symmetric. In order to consider a generic situation we introduce asymmetric as well as symmetric variation of the QPC potential. The model for the QPC potential is given in the form

$$V(x) = \begin{cases} V_0 - \frac{1}{2}m\omega_x^2 x^2 & \text{for } -x_0 < x < x_0, \\ \tilde{V_0} & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \tag{13}$$

where $x_0 \equiv \sqrt{\hbar/m\omega_x}$ characterizes the length scale of the QPC with the constant potential $\tilde{V_0} = V_0 - \frac{1}{2}m\omega_x^2 x_0^2$ outside the QPC region. The potential variation due to an excess QD charge is introduced in the following form including asymmetry,

$$\delta V(x) = \begin{cases} \delta V_s & \text{for } -a < x < x_0, \\ \delta V_s + \delta V_a & \text{for } x_0 < x < a, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \tag{14}$$

where a sets the scale of the range for the potential being affected by the excess QD charge. δV_s and δV_a represent the symmetric and asymmetric components of the potential variation due to the excess QD charge, respectively. It should be noted that $a \gg x_0$ is expected in typical geometries of controlled dephasing experiments [1, 2, 10], because the QPC is made very narrow, and the excess charge of the QD affects the potential in much wider region.

The transmission probability T_d for the potential (13) is mainly determined by the region of $|x| \lesssim x_0$, then T_d can be obtained from the inverse harmonic potential [26]

$$T_d \simeq \frac{1}{1+\exp\left(-\pi\varepsilon_0\right)}, \tag{15}$$

where the dimensionless variable ε_0 is defined by

$$\varepsilon_0 = 2(E - V_0)/\hbar\omega_x \ . \tag{16}$$

We can obtain the change of the transmission probability

$$\Delta T_d \simeq -2\pi T_d(1-T_d)\delta v_s, \tag{17}$$

where $\delta v_s \equiv \delta V_s/\hbar\omega_x$. The phase change can be estimated with the help of the WKB approximation as

$$\Delta\phi \simeq \int_{x_0}^{a} \delta k(x)\, dx \ , \tag{18}$$

where $\delta k(x) \equiv \frac{\sqrt{2m}}{\hbar}[\sqrt{E-(V(x)+\Delta V_s+\delta V_a)} - \sqrt{E-(V(x)+\Delta V_s)}]$ for $x_0 < x < a$. Note that the

symmetric part δV_s does not contribute to $\Delta\phi$ because the phase change for the transmission and the reflection components are exactly canceled for the symmetric potential variation [24, 25]. Then we find for $a \gg x_0$,

$$\Delta\phi \simeq -\delta v_a \frac{a}{x_0} , \tag{19}$$

where $\delta v_a \equiv \delta V_a/\hbar\omega_x$. With the help of Eqs. (6,17,18) we obtain

$$\Gamma_T = \pi^2 \frac{eV_d}{h} T_d(1-T_d)(\delta v_s)^2 \tag{20a}$$

$$\Gamma_\phi = \frac{eV_d}{h} T_d(1-T_d)(\delta v_a)^2 (a/x_0)^2. \tag{20b}$$

Because $a \gg x_0$ for the typical geometry of the QPC detector, the condition $\Gamma_\phi \gg \Gamma_T$ can be achieved if the asymmetric component of $\delta V(x)$ is not negligible compared to the symmetric part (That is $\delta v_a \sim \delta v_s$). The crucial point is that the transmission probability is affected only by the region $|x| \lesssim x_0$, while the phase is affected through relatively wide region (up to $|x| \sim a$), so that the phase-sensitive detection is much more effective. This can be a natural explanation for the anomalously large decoherence rate observed in Ref.[10].

Finally, we would like to remark on the T_d-dependence of Γ_d. According to Eq.(20), both Γ_T and Γ_ϕ (therefore Γ_d) are proportional to the partition noise ($\propto T_d(1-T_d)$) of the ideal single-channel QPC. However, the experimental Γ_d-T_d curve shows a double peak behavior [10] in contrast to Eq.(20). This qualitative discrepancy might be related to the so called "0.7 anomaly" [28] where the shot noise is also suppressed [29], or to the charge screening effect [9, 30]. This issue requires more careful experimental and theoretical analysis on the correlation between the decoherence at the QD and the shot noise at the QPC.

In conclusion, we have presented a theory of the controlled dephasing of the Kondo state in a QD via the charge state measurement in a nearby QPC device. The Kondo-assisted transport is suppressed by the magnitude- and the phase-sensitive detection in the QPC. We have discussed on the condition in which the phase-sensitive detection can be dominant in generic situation, which may be the explanation on the unusually large decoherence observed in a recent experiment [10]. We have also pointed out that it is important to study the correlation between the shot noise in the detector and the decoherence in the QD.

Helpful discussions with Y.-C. Chung and G. L. Khym are greatly appreciated. This work was supported by the KOSEF (R05-2004-000-10826-0)

* Electronic address: kckang@chonnam.ac.kr

[1] E. Buks, R. Schuster, M. Heiblum, D. Mahalu, and V. Umansky, Nature **391**, 871 (1998).
[2] D. Sprinzak, E. Buks, M. Heiblum, and H. Shtrikman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 5820 (2000).
[3] A. L. Yacoby, M. Heiblum, D. Mahalu, and H. Shtrikman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 4047 (1995).
[4] R. Schuster, E. Buks, M. Heiblum, D. Mahadu, V. Umansky and H. Shtrikman, Nature **385**, 417 (1997).
[5] I. L. Aleiner, N. S. Wingreen, and Y. Meir, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 3740 (1997).
[6] Y. Levinson, Europhys. Lett. **39**, 299 (1997); Phys. Rev. B **61**, 4748 (2000).
[7] S. A. Gurvitz, Phys. Rev. B **56**, 15 215 (1997).
[8] L. Stodolsky, Phys. Lett. B **459**, 193 (1999).
[9] M. Büttiker and A. M. Martin, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 2737 (2000).
[10] M. Avinun-Kalish, M. Heiblum, A. Silva, D. Mahalu, and V. Umansky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 156801 (2004).
[11] For a review, see. e.g., A. C. Hewson, *The Kondo Problem to Heavy Fermions* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1993).
[12] D. Goldhaber-Gordon, H. Shtrikman, D. Abush-Magder, U. Meirav and M. A. Kastner, Nature **391**, 156 (1998); D. Goldhaber-Gordon *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 5225 (1998).
[13] S. M. Cronenwett, T. H. Oosterkamp, and L. P. Kouwenhoven, Science **281**, 540 (1998).
[14] J. Schmid *et al.*, Physica **256B-258B**, 182 (1998).
[15] F. Simmel *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 804 (1999).
[16] Y. Ji, M. Heiblum, D. Sprinzak, D. Mahalu, and H. Shtrikman, Science **290**, 779 (2000).
[17] W. G. van der Wiel, S. De Franceschi, T. Fujisawa, J. M. Elzerman, S. Tarucha, and L. P. Kouwenhoven, Science **289**, 2105 (2000).
[18] L. Kouwenhoven and L. Glazman, Physics World, January 2001, 33 (2001).
[19] A. Silva and S. Levit, Europhys. Lett. **62**, 103 (2003).
[20] G. Hackenbroich, Phys. Rep. **343**, 463 (2001).
[21] O. Gunnarsson and K. Schönhammer, Phys. Rev. B **28**, 4315 (1983).
[22] G. Hackenbroich, B. Rosenow, and H. A. Weidenmüller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 5896 (1998).
[23] Note that the reduction factor of the conductance obtained here has different functional form compared with the one obtained from the slave-boson mean-field theory [19].
[24] A. N. Korotkov and D. V. Averin, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 165310 (2001).
[25] S. Pilgram and M. Büttiker, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 200401 (2002).
[26] H. A. Fertig and B. I. Halperin, Phys. Rev. B **36**, 7969 (1987).
[27] M. Büttiker, Phys. Rev. B **41**, 7906 (1990).
[28] D. J. Reilly, T. M. Buehler, J. L. O'Brien, A. R. Hamilton, A. S. Dzurak, R. G. Clark, B. E. Kane, L. N. Pfeiffer, and K. W. West, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 246801 (2002); S. M. Cronenwett, H. J. Lynch, D. Goldhaber-Gordon, L. P. Kouwenhoven, C. M. Marcus, K. Hirose, N. S. Wingreen, and V. Umansky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 226805 (2002).
[29] P. Roche, J. Ségala, D. C. Glattli, and J. T. Nicholls, M Pepper, A. C. Graham, K. J. Thomas, M. Y. Simmons, and D. A. Ritchi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 116602 (2004).
[30] M. Büttiker and S. Pilgram, Surf. Sci. **532**, 617 (2003).